0000039662

EG&G ROCKY FLATS

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

DATE: August ~~23~~ 24, 1994

From: ~~TO:~~ T. d. Beckman, SPP, Bldg 080, X8725

To: ~~FROM:~~ R. A. Stults, Procurement, Bldg 080, X8514

SUBJECT: TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF HALLIBURTON NUS' DETAILED DEFINITIZATION PROPOSAL FOR MTS TASK ORDER MTS 225471001ST3, ACCELERATED SLUDGE PROCESSING CONCEPTUAL DESIGN
RAS-153-94
TdB-036-94

The attached proposal is forwarded for Technical Evaluation. Please provide your written comments by August 26, 1994, in order to meet the acquisition schedule.

Your assessment should concentrate on the following information which is derived from the attached April 1993 "Guide for Performing and Preparing Technical Evaluations of Subcontractor Proposals." Your response may be **handwritten, however, for clarification purposes please follow up with a typewritten copy.** For proposals submitted competitively, please submit a **separate** response for each proposal. Additional pages should be attached as necessary, especially to support "no" answers. Additionally, this may be important if there is a lengthy scenario (i.e., when task level, skill category, rate by MTS/ASC year, etc. are necessary.) Please attach a Purchase Requisition (PR) if additional funds are required.

1. Statement of Work

	(Y)	(N)	(N/A)	
a.	X			Are the proposed work statement and schedule compatible with the technical requirement and are assumptions made by the Offeror acceptable?
b.				If there were incorrect assumptions made, tasks omitted by the Offeror, or no is answered above, please indicate what and why (use separate sheet if necessary.)_____

ADMIN RECORD

2. Labor

(Y)(N)(N/A)

a. (X)( )( ) Do the number of labor hours proposed by the Offeror compare to the number of hours in the cost estimate submitted with the Purchase Requisition (PR)? HB

b. (X)( )( ) On the proposed labor mix and skill level, do the labor classifications and capabilities offered compare to the various tasks specified in the SOW and are they reasonable and appropriately balanced between manager and worker? HB

c. (X)( )( ) Are the proposed technical personnel appropriately qualified to perform the SOW? HB

d. If there is a no answer above, please indicate what and why. Additionally, after evaluating each proposed labor category and the proposed hours per task, determine the position that you want to take for reducing hours, if applicable, and explain your rational. Also indicate the maximum position you are willing to take to increase hours per labor category per task from your stated position in the event the Offeror presents arguments, justification, clarification, etc., that would cause you to allow an increase in hours from your stated position (use separate sheet if necessary.) _____

3. Other Direct Costs (ODCs)

(Y)(N)(N/A)

a. (X)( )( ) Are the ODCs proposed by the Offeror reasonable? Review all items by questions need, quantity, adequacy, and possibility of a less expensive substitute. Provide justification/rationale where you differ with the proposed ODCs. HB

However: Assumptions & Conditions #9 does not allow HWUS to make more trips than proposed w/o CTR approval. In other words only the proposed trips are approved as proposed.

b. ( )( )(X) Are there ODC rental items proposed that will require a Justification for Lease (JFL) form PDI-103? Please attach. HB

147

c. (X)( )( ) If labor hours are detailed for lower tier subcontractors, do the number of labor hours proposed by the Offeror compare to the number of hours in the cost estimate submitted with the Purchase Requisition (PR) and do the labor classifications and capabilities offered compare to the various tasks specified in the SOW?

d. If there is a no answer above, please indicate what and why (use separate sheet if necessary.) _____

4. Travel

(Y)(N)(N/A)

a. (X)( )( ) Is the proposed travel, including number of trips, number of people, destinations, number of per diem days, etc., necessary and appropriate for the accomplishment of the SOW?

b. If there is a no answer above, please indicate what and why (use separate sheet if necessary.) _____

However See ODCs #3a. above.

5. Schedule

(Y)(N)(N/A)

a. (X)( )( ) Is the proposed schedule realistic for completion of the SOW?

b. (X)( )( ) Do proposed deliverables meet program need dates?

c. If there is a no answer above, please indicate what and why (use separate sheet if necessary.) _____

6. Resumes

(Y)(N)(N/A)

(X)( )( ) As a result of your review of resumes, are all personnel acceptable at the labor category proposed? If approved, please complete the stamped approval found on each resume in the Technical Volume of the Offeror and return a copy with this Technical evaluation. If not approved, please explain.
MB

Robert please stamp each resume for my approval and resubmit to me. Thank!

7. Evaluation Criteria

For proposals submitted competitively, provide as an attachment, the points you scored for each proposal based on the weighted evaluation criteria. Procurement will evaluate cost. Include an overall statement for each proposal as to whether it is acceptable or unacceptable.

8. Government Furnished Property

If Government Furnished Property (GFP) will be provided, attach a list that has a complete description including, but not limited to, manufacturer, model no., part no., year, serial no., etc; the Government Property Number; and the number of units of each item to be provided to the awardee.

Should you have questions, please contact me at the above extension.

dma

Enclosures:
As Stated

Technical Evaluation performed by:

Thomas d. Beckman (CTR)
Name & Leon A. Collins (Asst. CTR - Technical)

Thomas d. Beckman
Signature

24 Aug 94
Date

Halliburton NUS
CORPORATION

910 Clopper Road
Gaithersburg, MD 20878-1399

(301) 258-6000

COPY
WITHOUT LABOR RATES

EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc.
Mr. Robert A. Stults, Sr.
Subcontract Administrator
Procurement, Interlocken
P.O. Box 464
Golden, CO 80402-0464

Subject: Proposal for Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design

Reference:
a) EG&G Rocky Flats Request For Proposal MTS 225471001AS3/ST3 dtd 12 Jul 1994
b) HNUS ltr dtd 04 Aug 1994, A. Micheli (HNUS) to R. Stults (EG&G); ROM estimate
c) EG&G ltr dtd 16 Aug 1994 R. Stults (EG&G) to B. Brosch (HNUS); Amendment No. 1 to RFP MTS 225471001AS3/ST3
d) Letter Task Order 225471001ST3 dtd 08 Aug 1994

Enclosure:
1) SF 1411 (original) and cost data dtd 17 Aug 1994
2) Basis of Estimate dtd 17 Aug 1994
3) Assumptions and Conditions dtd 17 Aug 1994
4) Statement of Work (Redlined Version)
5) OCI Disclosure Statement dtd 17 Aug 1994
6) Technical Volume dtd 17 Aug 1994

Dear Mr. Stults:

Halliburton NUS Corporation (HNUS), has completed it review of the red-lined version of the statement of work and is pleased to provide to EG&G Rocky Flats , in accordance with References (a) through (c), three copies of our Fixed Hourly Rate proposal for Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design. Our proposal consists of three copies of the Cost Volume (1 without labor rates) provided as Enclosures (1) through (5) and three copies of the Technical Volume, that includes the project schedule, as Enclosure (6).

Please be advised that the enclosed data are considered competition sensitive and proprietary and therefore, it is requested that such is handled in accordance with U.S. Code 5 U.S.C. 552.

147

Attachment 1

Enclosure (1) consists of Standard Form 1411 and cost schedules that phase cost by subtask time periods, Government fiscal year, and MTS labor rate time periods. Enclosure (2) provides the basis of estimate (BOE). The BOE fully discloses, in accordance with Part 15 of the FAR, that the costs are current, accurate, and complete. Enclosure (3) provides the Assumptions and Conditions upon which the estimated price, schedule and scope are predicated. Enclosure (4) provides the statement of work "Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design dated August 3, 1994, Revision 1, (Red-lined) and Greatly Accelerated Sludge Processing Meeting Minutes dated August 1, 1994 which combined determine the baseline for HNUS performance. Enclosure (5) provides the OCI Disclosure Statement.

Enclosure (6) provides the Technical Volume that includes the technical understanding and approach, scope of work summary, and project schedule.

This proposal shall remain valid for a period of ninety (90) days. If you have any questions, please call me on (301) 258-6051 or fax (301) 258-5887.

Sincerely,

Halliburton NUS Corporation

Barry Brosch
Senior Contract Administrator

cc: D. Brenneman/Alief
R. Ninesteel/Foster Plaza
T. Snare/Foster Plaza

147

Attachment 1

CONTRACT PRICING PROPOSAL COVER SHEET	1. Solicitation/Contract/Modification MTS 225471001AS3/ST3	FORM APPROVED OMS NO.9000-0013

NOTE: This form is used in contract actions if submission of cost or pricing data is required. (See FAR 15.804-6(b))

2. NAME AND ADDRESS OF OFFEROR (Include ZIP Code)	3A. Name and Title of Offeror's Point of Contact	3B. Telephone No.
Halliburton NUS Corporation 910 Clopper Road Gaithersburg, Maryland 20878	Barry Brosch Senior Contract Administrator	(301) 258-6051

4. Type of Contract Action (Check)

[ ]	A. New Contract	[ ]	D. Letter
[ ]	B. Change Order (Revision)	[ ]	E. Unpriced Order
[ ]	C. Price Revision/ Redetermination	[X]	F. Other (Specify) Task Order

5. Type of Contract (Check)

[ ] FFP [ ] CPFF [ ] CPIF [ ] CPAF
[ ] FPI [X] OTHER (Specify) Fixed Hourly Rate

6. Proposed Cost (A+B=C)

A. Cost	B. Profit/Fee	C. Total
		242,569.95

7. Place(s) and Period(s) of Performance
Pittsburgh, PA — August 8, 1994 through November 30, 1994

8. List and reference the identification, quantity and total price proposed for each contract line item. A line item cost breakdown supporting this recap is required unless otherwise specified by the Contracting Officer. (Continue on reverse)

A. LINE ITEM NO.	B. IDENTIFICATION	C. QUANTITY	D. TOTAL PRICE	E. REF.
	Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design	2897	218,932.79	See Attached Cost Proposal
	Proposal Cost	426	23,637.16	

9. PROVIDE NAME, ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBER FOR THE FOLLOWING (If available)

A. Contract Administration Office	B. Audit Office
DCMAO Baltimore (410) 339-4776 200 Towsontown Blvd., West Towson, MD 21204-5299 Attn: Walter Geisler	DCAA, Harold V. Barnett (301) 816-1420 Silver Spring Branch Office, Metro Plaza II 8403 Colesville Road, Suite 620 Silver Spring, MD 20910-3312

10. Will you require the use of any Government Property in the performance of this work? (If "Yes," identify.)
[ ] Yes [X] No

11. Do you require Government Contract Financing to perform this proposed contract? (If "Yes," complete Item 11B)
[X] Yes [ ] No

11B. Type of Financing (check one)
[ ] Advance Payments [X] Progress Payments [ ] Other [ ] Guaranteed Loans

12. Have you been awarded any contracts or subcontracts for the same or similar items within the past 3 years? (If "Yes," identify item(s), customer(s) and contract No.)
[X] Yes [ ] No

13. Is this proposal consistent with your established estimating and accounting practices and procedures and FAR Part 31 Cost Principles? (If "No," explain)
[X] Yes [ ] No

14. COST ACCOUNTING STANDARDS BOARD (CASB) DATA (Public Law 91-379 as amended and FAR Part 30)

A. Will this contract action be subjecct to CASB regulations? (If "No," explain in proposal)
[X] Yes [ ] No

B. Have you submitted a CASB Disclosure Statement (CASB DS-1 or 2)? (If "Yes," specify in proposal the office to which submitted and if determined to be adequate)
[X] Yes [ ] No DCMAO (see block 9B)

C. Have you been notified that you are or may be in non-compliance with your disclosure statement of cost accounting standards? (If "Yes," explain in proposal)
[X] Yes [ ] No (See Attachment)

D. Is any aspect of this proposal inconsistent with your disclosed practices or applicable cost accounting standards? (If "Yes," explain in proposal)
[ ] Yes [X] No

This proposal is submitted in response to the RFP, contract modification, etc. in Item 1 and reflects our best estimates and/or actual costs as of this date and conforms with the instructions in FAR 15.804-6(b) (2), Table 15-2. By submitting this proposal, the offeror, if selected for negotiation, grants the contracting officer or an authorized representative the right to examine, at any time before award, those books, records, documents and other types of factual information regardless of form or whether such supporting information is specifically referenced or included in the proposal as the basis for pricing, that will permit an adequate evaluation of the proposed price.

15. Name and Title (Type)	16. Name of Firm
Robert Waller, Vice President	Halliburton NUS Corporation

17. Signature	18. Date of submission
Robert Waller	August 17, 1994

1411-102 — Standard Form 1411 (Rev. 7-87) FAR (48 CFR) 53.215-2(c)

147

attachments

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/17/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design

Task 1 - White Paper

Period of Performance: August 8, 1994 through August 12, 1994

Employee	Labor Category	Hours	Rate	Cost
Ninesteel	Proj Mgr	0		
Montroy	Prog Mgr	0		
Brenneman	Sr. Phy Scientist	0		
Francis	Sr. Phy Scientist	0		
Yesso	Sr. Phy Scientist	0		
Briggs	Sr. Engineer	0		
Glorieux	Sr. Engineer	15		
Henderson, W.	Sr. Engineer	40		
Hughes	Sr. Engineer	30		
Olmstead	Sr. Engineer	9		
Brosch	Engineer I	0		
Finke	Engineer I	0		
Flory	Engineer II	5		
Jonnet	Engineer II	0		
Olup	Engineer III	0		
Snare	Engineer III	0		
Alex	Clerical	0		
Mandus	Clerical	0		
Total Labor		99		7,547.68
Subcontracts				
Other Direct Costs				
Computer Usage (Attachment A)		0	3.48 /hour	0.00
Plotter Usage- Bond		0	8.00 /each	0.00
Plotter Usage- Vellum		0	12.00 /each	0.00
Federal Express (Attachment B)		0	29.74 /12 lb pack	0.00
Travel (Attachment C)				0.00
Total Price				7,547.68

Attachment 2

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/17/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design

Task 1 - White Paper

Period of Performance: August 13, 1994 through August 24, 1994

Employee	Labor Category	Hours	Rate	Cost
Ninesteel	Proj Mgr	0		
Montroy	Prog Mgr	0		
Brenneman	Sr. Phy Scientist	0		
Francis	Sr. Phy Scientist	8		
Yesso	Sr. Phy Scientist	0		
Briggs	Sr. Engineer	0		
Glorieux	Sr. Engineer	30		
Henderson, W.	Sr. Engineer	50		
Hughes	Sr. Engineer	56		
Olmstead	Sr. Engineer	40		
Brosch	Engineer I	0		
Finke	Engineer I	15		
Flory	Engineer II	15		
Jonnet	Engineer II	40		
Olup	Engineer III	0		
Snare	Engineer III	0		
Alex	Clerical	10		
Mandus	Clerical	30		
Total Labor		294		20,578.19
Subcontracts				
Other Direct Costs				
Computer Usage (Attachment A)		150	3.48 /hour	522.00
Plotter Usage- Bond		0	8.00 /each	0.00
Plotter Usage- Vellum		0	12.00 /each	0.00
Federal Express (Attachment B)		1	29.74 /12 lb pack	29.74
Travel (Attachment C)				0.00
Total Price				21,129.93

Attachment 2

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/17/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design

Task 1 - White Paper SUMMARY

Period of Performance: August 8, 1994 through August 24, 1994

Employee	Labor Category	Hours	Rate	Cost
Ninesteel	Proj Mgr	0		
Montroy	Prog Mgr	0		
Brenneman	Sr. Phy Scientist	0		
Francis	Sr. Phy Scientist	8		
Yesso	Sr. Phy Scientist	0		
Briggs	Sr. Engineer	0		
Glorieux	Sr. Engineer	45		
Henderson, W.	Sr. Engineer	90		
Hughes	Sr. Engineer	86		
Olmstead	Sr. Engineer	49		
Brosch	Engineer I	0		
Finke	Engineer I	15		
Flory	Engineer II	20		
Jonnet	Engineer II	40		
Olup	Engineer III	0		
Snare	Engineer III	0		
Alex	Clerical	10		
Mandus	Clerical	30		
Total Labor		393		28,352.12
Subcontracts				
Other Direct Costs				
Computer Usage (Attachment A)		150	3.48 /hour	522.00
Plotter Usage- Bond		0	8.00 /each	0.00
Plotter Usage- Vellum		0	12.00 /each	0.00
Federal Express (Attachment B)		1	29.74 /12 lb pack	29.74
Travel (Attachment C)				0
Total Price				28,903.86

Attachment 2

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/17/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design

Task 2 - CDR Draft & Final

Period of Performance: August 8, 1994 through August 12, 1994

Employee	Labor Category	Hours	Rate	Cost
Ninesteel	Proj Mgr	0		
Montroy	Prog Mgr	1		
Brenneman	Sr. Phy Scientist	10		
Francis	Sr. Phy Scientist	8		
Yesso	Sr. Phy Scientist	0		
Briggs	Sr. Engineer	0		
Glorieux	Sr. Engineer	0		
Henderson, W.	Sr. Engineer	0		
Hughes	Sr. Engineer	0		
Olmstead	Sr. Engineer	0		
Brosch	Engineer I	0		
Finke	Engineer I	0		
Flory	Engineer II	0		
Jonnet	Engineer II	0		
Olup	Engineer III	4		
Snare	Engineer III	25		
Alex	Clerical	0		
Mandus	Clerical	5		
Total Labor		53		2,959.75
Subcontracts				
Other Direct Costs				
Computer Usage (Attachment A)		0	3.48 /hour	0.00
Plotter Usage- Bond		0	8.00 /each	0.00
Plotter Usage- Vellum		0	12.00 /each	0.00
Federal Express (Attachment B)		0	58.71 /50 lb pack	0.00
Travel (Attachment C)				3,835.00
Total Price				6,794.75

Attachment 2

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/17/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design

Task 2 - CDR Draft & Final

Period of Performance: August 13, 1994 through November 30, 1994

Employee	Labor Category	Hours	Rate	Cost
Ninesteel	Proj Mgr	118		
Montroy	Prog Mgr	14		
Brenneman	Sr. Phy Scientist	104		
Francis	Sr. Phy Scientist	40		
Yesso	Sr. Phy Scientist	32		
Briggs	Sr. Engineer	8		
Glorieux	Sr. Engineer	230		
Henderson, W.	Sr. Engineer	328		
Hughes	Sr. Engineer	460		
Olmstead	Sr. Engineer	346		
Brosch	Engineer I	14		
Finke	Engineer I	90		
Flory	Engineer II	65		
Jonnet	Engineer II	130		
Olup	Engineer III	64		
Snare	Engineer III	208		
Alex	Clerical	20		
Mandus	Clerical	180		
Total Labor		2,451		173,146.01
Subcontracts				
Other Direct Costs				
Computer Usage (Attachment A)		350	3.48 /hour	1,218.00
Plotter Usage- Bond		11	8.00 /each	88.00
Plotter Usage- Vellum		11	12.00 /each	132.00
Federal Express (Attachment B)		2	58.71 /50 lb pack	117.42
Travel (Attachment C)				8,759.00
Total Price				183,460.43

Attachment 2

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/17/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design

Project Summary Period 1

Period of Performance: August 8, 1994 through August 12, 1994

Employee	Labor Category	Hours	Rate	Cost
Ninesteel	Proj Mgr	0		
Montroy	Prog Mgr	1		
Brenneman	Sr. Phy Scientist	10		
Francis	Sr. Phy Scientist	8		
Yesso	Sr. Phy Scientist	0		
Briggs	Sr. Engineer	0		
Glorieux	Sr. Engineer	15		
Henderson, W.	Sr. Engineer	40		
Hughes	Sr. Engineer	30		
Olmstead	Sr. Engineer	9		
Brosch	Engineer I	0		
Finke	Engineer I	0		
Flory	Engineer II	5		
Jonnet	Engineer II	0		
Olup	Engineer III	4		
Snare	Engineer III	25		
Alex	Clerical	0		
Mandus	Clerical	5		
Total Labor		152		10,507.43
Subcontracts				
Other Direct Costs				
Computer Usage (Attachment A)		0	3.48 /hour	0.00
Plotter Usage- Bond		0	8.00 /each	0.00
Plotter Usage- Vellum		0	12.00 /each	0.00
Federal Express (Attachment B)		0		0.00
Travel (Attachment C)				3,835.00
Total Price				14,342.43

mln

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/17/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design

Task 2 - CDR Draft & Final SUMMARY

Period of Performance: August 8, 1994 through November 30, 1994

Employee	Labor Category	Hours		Cost
Ninesteel	Proj Mgr	118		
Montroy	Prog Mgr	15		
Brenneman	Sr. Phy Scientist	114		
Francis	Sr. Phy Scientist	48		
Yesso	Sr. Phy Scientist	32		
Briggs	Sr. Engineer	8		
Glorieux	Sr. Engineer	230		
Henderson, W.	Sr. Engineer	328		
Hughes	Sr. Engineer	460		
Olmstead	Sr. Engineer	346		
Brosch	Engineer I	14		
Finke	Engineer I	90		
Flory	Engineer II	65		
Jonnet	Engineer II	130		
Olup	Engineer III	68		
Snare	Engineer III	233		
Alex	Clerical	20		
Mandus	Clerical	185		
Total Labor		2,504		176,105.76
Subcontracts				
Other Direct Costs				
Computer Usage (Attachment A)		350	3.48 /hour	1,218.00
Plotter Usage- Bond		11	8.00 /each	88.00
Plotter Usage- Vellum		11	12.00 /each	132.00
Federal Express (Attachment B)		2	58.71 /50 lb pack	117.42
Travel (Attachment C)				12,594.00
Total Price				190,255.18

 Attachments

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/17/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design

Project Summary Period 2

Period of Performance: August 13, 1994 through September 30, 1994

Employee	Labor Category	Hours	Rate	Cost
Ninesteel	Proj Mgr	56		
Montroy	Prog Mgr	7		
Brenneman	Sr. Phy Scientist	48		
Francis	Sr. Phy Scientist	24		
Yesso	Sr. Phy Scientist	8		
Briggs	Sr. Engineer	4		
Glorieux	Sr. Engineer	140		
Henderson, W.	Sr. Engineer	230		
Hughes	Sr. Engineer	296		
Olmstead	Sr. Engineer	210		
Brosch	Engineer I	12		
Finke	Engineer I	65		
Flory	Engineer II	35		
Jonnet	Engineer II	120		
Olup	Engineer III	28		
Snare	Engineer III	112		
Alex	Clerical	10		
Mandus	Clerical	90		
Total Labor		1,495		107,056.12
Subcontracts				
Other Direct Costs				
Computer Usage (Attachment A)		250	3.48 /hour	870.00
Plotter Usage- Bond		0	8.00 /each	0.00
Plotter Usage- Vellum		0	12.00 /each	0.00
Federal Express (Attachment B)		1	29.74 /50 lb pack	29.74
Travel (Attachment C)				3,230.00
Total Price				111,185.86

 Attachment 2

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/17/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design
Project Summary Period 3
Period of Performance: October 1, 1994 through November 30, 1994

Employee	Labor Category	Hours	Rate	Cost
Ninesteel	Proj Mgr	62		
Montroy	Prog Mgr	7		
Brenneman	Sr. Phy Scientist	56		
Francis	Sr. Phy Scientist	24		
Yesso	Sr. Phy Scientist	24		
Briggs	Sr. Engineer	4		
Glorieux	Sr. Engineer	120		
Henderson, W.	Sr. Engineer	148		
Hughes	Sr. Engineer	220		
Olmstead	Sr. Engineer	176		
Brosch	Engineer I	2		
Finke	Engineer I	40		
Flory	Engineer II	45		
Jonnet	Engineer II	50		
Olup	Engineer III	36		
Snare	Engineer III	96		
Alex	Clerical	20		
Mandus	Clerical	120		
Total Labor		1,250		86,668.08
Subcontracts				
Other Direct Costs				
Computer Usage (Attachment A)		250	3.48 /hour	870.00
Plotter Usage- Bond		11	8.00 /each	88.00
Plotter Usage- Vellum		11	12.00 /each	132.00
Federal Express (Attachment B)		2	58.71 /50 lb pack	117.42
Travel (Attachment C)				5,529.00
Total Price				93,404.50

Attachment 2
MOR 10 of 25

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/17/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design
TOTAL PROJECT SUMMARY ALL PERIODS
Period of Performance: August 8, 1994 through November 30, 1994

Employee	Labor Category	Hours		Cost
Ninesteel	Proj Mgr	118		
Montroy	Prog Mgr	15		
Brenneman	Sr. Phy Scientist	114		
Francis	Sr. Phy Scientist	56		
Yesso	Sr. Phy Scientist	32		
Briggs	Sr. Engineer	8		
Glorieux	Sr. Engineer	275		
Henderson, W.	Sr. Engineer	418		
Hughes	Sr. Engineer	546		
Olmstead	Sr. Engineer	395		
Brosch	Engineer I	14		
Finke	Engineer I	105		
Flory	Engineer II	85		
Jonnet	Engineer II	170		
Olup	Engineer III	68		
Snare	Engineer III	233		
Alex	Clerical	30		
Mandus	Clerical	215		
Total Labor		2,897		204,231.63
Subcontracts				
Other Direct Costs				
Computer Usage (Attachment A)		500	3.48 /hour	1,740.00
Plotter Usage- Bond		11	8.00 /each	88.00
Plotter Usage- Vellum		11	12.00 /each	132.00
Federal Express (Attachment B)		3		147.16
Travel (Attachment C)				12,594.00
Total Price				218,932.79

Attachment 2

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/17/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design Proposal Cost

Employee	Labor Category	Hours	Rate	Cost
Ninesteel	Proj Mgr	84		
Montroy	Prog Mgr	0		
Brenneman	Sr. Phy Scientist	0		
Francis	Sr. Phy Scientist	0		
Yesso	Sr. Phy Scientist	0		
Briggs	Sr. Engineer	0		
Glorieux	Sr. Engineer	20		
Henderson, W.	Sr. Engineer	0		
Hughes	Sr. Engineer	14		
Olmstead	Sr. Engineer	7		
Brosch	Engineer I	56		
Finke	Engineer I	2		
Flory	Engineer II	0		
Jonnet	Engineer II	7		
Olup	Engineer III	0		
Snare	Engineer III	162		
Alex	Clerical	0		
Mandus	Clerical	74		
Total Labor		426		23,637.16

 attachments

8/17 0008 12 9825

ATTACHMENT A

COMPUTER USAGE

Attachment 2
page 13 of 25

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/15/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Project Pondcrete and Saltcrete Treatability Studies
ATTACHMENT A - COMPUTER USAGE

Cost

386 Computer	5.5 /day
HP Laserjet III	2.25 /day
	7.75 /day
	54.25 /week
	2821 /year

Utilization

365 days/yr
-8 holidays
-104 weekend days
253 avail. days

Usuage Rate Calculation

$$\frac{\text{2821 annual cost}}{\text{253 avail. days}} = \frac{\text{11.1502 daily cost}}{\text{8 hours/day}} = \frac{\text{1.393775 hourly cost}}{\text{0.4 utilization factor}}$$

$$= \boxed{\$3.48}$$

 Attachment 2

ATTACHMENT B

FEDERAL EXPRESS RATES

Attachment 2
DOE150825

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/15/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Project Pondcrete and Saltcrete Treatability Studies
ATTACHMENT B - FEDERAL EXPRESS RATES

ACCOUNT NO. 0152-0168-1

HALLIBURTON NUS
661 ANDERSON DR.
PITTSBURGH PA 15220

Tuesday
04/06/93

SPECIAL HANDLING FEES	ADDITIONAL PER-PACKAGE CHARGE **
Weekend Pick-up **** Service	$ 10.00
Weekend Delivery **** Service	$ 10.00
Holiday Delivery ***** Service	$ 0.00
Dangerous Goods Service	$ 10.00
Collect on Delivery Service	$ 5.00
Address Correction (per shipment).....	$ 5.00

Declared Value - For packages exceeding $100 in value ***
$ 0.50 per $100 of coverage
$2.50 minimum charge up to $500.00

CONTINENTAL U.S. TO	ALASKA / HAWAII (per shipment)	
Priority Letter.....$	5.00	5.00
Priority Pak 1-2 lbs$	5.00	5.00
Priority Pak (3+ lbs) Priority Box Priority Tube.....$	10.00	10.00
Standard Overnight Letter.....$	5.00	5.00
Standard Overnight Package.....$	10.00	10.00
Priority Package....$	10.00	10.00
Economy 2-Day Svc...$	10.00	10.00

** When 'Hundredweight' rates apply, the Handling Fees above will be assessed one time per shipment.

*** Maximum Declared Value for any FEDEX Letter or FEDEX Pak in a shipment is $500.00

**** Saturday only. Sunday when available.

***** When available.

Federal Express reserves the right to charge a fee for 'billing services' provided for either customer convenience or for correction of customer generated mistakes. Please see the most recent Federal Express Worldwide Service Guide and Addenda for additional information.

For additional information about our services and rates, consult your Federal Express Worldwide Service Guide or contact your Federal Express Account Executive.

All rates apply only to outbound and inbound packages charged to and paid for by your account number as the sender or recipient and rates include the Excise Tax required by the Federal Government on the transportation of property by air.

Federal Express reserves the right at any time to amend, modify or discontinue discounts contained in this quotation upon prior notification.

All pricing will be based on chargeable weight. Chargeable weight is the greater of actual or dimensional weight. Domestic dimensional weight for Priority Overnight, Standard Overnight, and Economy 2-day Service will be calculated as follows:
(Length X Height X Width) /194

Attachment 2

ACCOUNT NO. 0152-0168-1

HALLIBURTON NUS
661 ANDERSON DR.
PITTSBURGH PA 15220

Tuesday
04/06/93

LBS	Priority Overnight Service	Standard Overnight Service	Economy 2-Day Svc.
100	116.00	100.00	90.00
101	117.16	101.00	90.90
102	118.32	102.00	91.80
103	119.48	103.00	92.70
104	120.64	104.00	93.60
105	121.80	105.00	94.50
106	122.96	106.00	95.40
107	124.12	107.00	96.30
108	125.28	108.00	97.20
109	126.44	109.00	98.10
110	127.60	110.00	99.00
111	128.76	111.00	99.90
112	129.92	112.00	100.80
113	131.08	113.00	101.70
114	132.24	114.00	102.60
115	133.40	115.00	103.50
116	134.56	116.00	104.40
117	135.72	117.00	105.30
118	136.88	118.00	106.20
119	138.04	119.00	107.10
120	139.20	120.00	108.00
121	140.36	121.00	108.90
122	141.52	122.00	109.80
123	142.68	123.00	110.70
124	143.84	124.00	111.60
125	145.00	125.00	112.50
126	146.16	126.00	113.40
127	147.32	127.00	114.30
128	148.48	128.00	115.20
129	149.64	129.00	116.10
130	150.80	130.00	117.00
131	151.96	131.00	117.90
132	153.12	132.00	118.80
133	154.28	133.00	119.70
134	155.44	134.00	120.60
135	156.60	135.00	121.50
136	157.76	136.00	122.40
137	158.92	137.00	123.30
138	160.08	138.00	124.20
139	161.24	139.00	125.10
140	162.40	140.00	126.00
141	163.56	141.00	126.90
142	164.72	142.00	127.80
143	165.88	143.00	128.70
144	167.04	144.00	129.60
145	168.20	145.00	130.50
146	169.36	146.00	131.40
147	170.52	147.00	132.30
148	171.68	148.00	133.20
149	172.84	149.00	134.10
150	174.00	150.00	135.00

HUNDREDWEIGHT PRICES:

	Priority Overnight	Economy Two-Day Svc.
100 - 299 lbs.	$ 1.16 per lb.	$ 0.90 per lb.
300 - 499 lbs.	1.16 per lb.	0.90 per lb.
500 - 999 lbs.	1.13 per lb.	0.89 per lb.
1000 lbs.& over	1.10 per lb.	0.86 per lb.

Your above rates reflect the following discounts

PRIORITY OVERNIGHT
HUNDREDWEIGHT ... 39.00%

ECONOMY TWO-DAY SVC.
HUNDREDWEIGHT ... 18.00%

* Call 1-800-238-5355 for your multiple package (Hundredweight) rates for shipments consisting of only Standard Overnight packages.

Attachment 2

ATTACHMENT C

TRAVEL EXPENSES

Attachment 2
DAQE 190825

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/17/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design
ATTACHMENT C - TRAVEL EXPENSES

Task 2 Conceptual Design Report

Houston, TX to Pittsburgh, PA

2	R.T. Airfare	720.00 *	1,440.00
15	days lodging	75.00	1,125.00
15	days meals & incidentals	34.00	510.00
15	days car rental & gas	40.00	600.00
2	Person/Trip Airport parking & transport	80.00	160.00
	SUBTOTAL COST		3,835.00

One trip for W. Henderson (12 days)
One trip for D. Brenneman (3 days)
Purpose: Attend both the kick-off and partnering meeting and assist in the development of the white paper.

* Cost based on airfare quote obtained on 21 Jul 1994. This travel has already occured. Invoice will reflect actual cost.

Total Estimated Travel Cost for Task 2 (this page only) 3,835.00

Attachment 2
page 20 of 25

Halliburton NUS Corporation
08/17/94

Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design
ATTACHMENT C - TRAVEL EXPENSES

Task 2 Conceptual Design Report

Pittsburgh to Denver, CO

2	R.T. Airfare	1,070.00	2,140.00
6	days lodging	77.00	462.00
6	days meals & incidentals	38.00	228.00
6	days car rental & gas	40.00	240.00
2	Person/Trip Airport parking & transport	80.00	160.00
	SUBTOTAL COST		3,230.00

One trip for 2 engineers (3 days/each) to the Rocky Flats Site.

Purpose: Site Visit

Task 2 Conceptual Design Report

Houston, TX to Pittsburgh, PA

4	R.T. Airfare	520.00	2,080.00
21	days lodging	75.00	1,575.00
21	days meals & incidentals	34.00	714.00
21	days car rental & gas	40.00	840.00
4	Person/Trip Airport parking & transport	80.00	320.00
	SUBTOTAL COST		5,529.00

One trip for W. Henderson (12 days)
Three trips for D. Brenneman (3 days/each)
Purpose: Attend project review meetings and assist with the development of the Conceptual Design Report

Total Estimated Travel Cost for Task 2 (this page only) 8,759.00

Attachment 2
page 2 of 25

BASIS OF ESTIMATE

Labor

In accordance with EG&G direction, Labor rates are based on the fixed hourly rate schedules contained in Master Task Subcontract MTS 225471AS. Halliburton NUS has assigned the fixed hourly rates to proposed individuals based on a comparison of individual qualifications to those contained in the Master Task Subcontract. The quantity of hours for the individual/labor category are based on an engineering estimate.

As stated above, the labor category rates utilized in the development of this proposal are based on the rates contained in MTS 225471AS. Therefore it is understood that the proposed labor rates are not based on current, accurate and complete pricing data. Attached are the most current Corporate grade rates. The applicable overhead and G&A rates that are applicable to the HNUS grade rates are 111.54 percent and 10.91 percent. These indirect rates are based on the proposed provisional rates for 1994 that have been submitted to DCAA.

As delineated in previous correspondence to EG&G Rocky Flats. The labor category rates contained in MTS 225471AS included all direct and indirect labor costs plus fee associated with the given labor category. In accordance with clause 38 of the MTS, they also include a nominal amount of Other Direct Costs and associated G&A for reproduction, telephone, and U.S. mail. Examples of direct cost elements which were not included in the MTS rates are subcontracts, Federal Express, laboratory analysis, equipment, travel, relocation, and computer usage. These elements were not included in the MTS because the need, quantity, and cost could only be determined/estimated at the task order level and some of these elements were specifically excluded from the rate by clause 38.

Other Direct Costs

Computer and Plotter usage quantities are based on an engineering estimate. The computer usage rates are based upon the calculations that are enclosed as Attachment A. Federal Express quantities and weights are based on an engineering estimate. The corporate Federal Express rates utilized are enclosed as Attachment B.

Attachment 2
Page 22 of 25

BASIS OF ESTIMATE

Travel

Proposed airfare costs are based on telephone price quote from Halliburton travel on 17 Aug 1994. Rates are based on coach economy class air transportation with a one week advanced, non-refundable purchase, when available. Per diem rates are based on current maximum daily rates found in the Federal Travel Regulations. Car rental rates are based on economy class car from Avis plus a gas allowance. A flat rate of $80 per trip per individual was used to estimate ground transportation and parking to and from the airport of origin. A break down of each trip is provided as Attachment C

SALARY RANGE STRUCTURE
ENGINEERING, TECHNICAL, ADMINISTRATIVE
NON-EXEMPT
($/MONTH, $/YEAR)
Effective Date: January 1, 1994

FORMAL SALARY RANGE

Salary Grade	Grade Minimum		Grade Midpoint		Grade Maximum	
	Hourly	Monthly	Hourly	Monthly	Hourly	Monthly
A	$4.27	$740	$5.08	$881	$5.89	$1,021
B	$4.51	$781	$5.86	$1,015	$7.21	$1,250
C	$5.20	$901	$6.76	$1,171	$8.31	$1,441
D	$5.99	$1,039	$7.79	$1,350	$9.59	$1,662
E	$6.91	$1,198	$8.98	$1,557	$11.06	$1,916
F	$7.97	$1,381	$10.36	$1,795	$12.75	$2,210
G	$9.19	$1,593	$11.94	$2,070	$14.70	$2,548
H	$10.59	$1,836	$13.77	$2,387	$16.95	$2,938
I	$12.22	$2,118	$15.88	$2,753	$19.55	$3,388
J	$14.09	$2,442	$18.31	$3,175	$22.54	$3,907
K	$16.25	$2,816	$21.12	$3,661	$25.99	$4,505
L	$18.73	$3,247	$24.35	$4,221	$29.97	$5,195
M	$21.60	$3,744	$28.08	$4,868	$34.56	$5,991
N	$24.91	$4,318	$32.38	$5,613	$39.86	$6,908
O	$28.72	$4,979	$37.34	$6,473	$45.96	$7,966

Note:

1. Hourly midpoint rounded to nearest $0.01.
2. Monthly salary provided for reference purposes only.
3. Monthly salary = ((Hourly rate x 2080) divided by 12).
4. Monthly salary rounded to nearest $1.00.

attachment 2
page 24 of 25

SALARY RANGE STRUCTURE
ENGINEERING, TECHNICAL, ADMINISTRATIVE
EXEMPT
($/MONTH, $/YEAR)
Effective Date: January 1, 1994

Salary Grade	FORMAL SALARY RANGE					
	Grade Minimum		Grade Midpoint		Grade Maximum	
	Monthly	Annual	Monthly	Annual	Monthly	Annual
05	$1,358	$16,302	$1,766	$21,192	$2,174	$26,082
06	$1,546	$18,557	$2,010	$24,124	$2,474	$29,691
07	$1,760	$21,124	$2,288	$27,462	$2,817	$33,799
08	$2,004	$24,047	$2,605	$31,261	$3,206	$38,475
09	$2,281	$27,374	$2,965	$35,586	$3,650	$43,798
10	$2,597	$31,161	$3,376	$40,509	$4,155	$49,858
11	$2,956	$35,472	$3,843	$46,114	$4,730	$56,755
12	$3,365	$40,380	$4,374	$52,494	$5,384	$64,608
13	$3,831	$45,966	$4,980	$59,756	$6,129	$73,546
14	$4,360	$52,326	$5,669	$68,024	$6,977	$83,721
15	$4,964	$59,565	$6,453	$77,435	$7,942	$95,304
16	$5,651	$67,806	$7,346	$88,148	$9,041	$108,490
17	$6,432	$77,187	$8,362	$100,344	$10,292	$123,500
18	$7,322	$87,866	$9,519	$114,226	$11,716	$140,586
19	$8,335	$100,023	$10,836	$130,030	$13,336	$160,037
20	$9,488	$113,861	$12,335	$148,020	$15,181	$182,178
21	$10,801	$129,614	$14,042	$168,498	$17,282	$207,383

Note: All figures are rounded to the nearest dollar.

Attachment 2
page 25 of 25

3/1/94

attachment 3

ASSUMPTIONS AND CONDITIONS

1. The work to be performed is defined by the statement of work entitled " Rocky Flats Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sludge Processing Conceptual Design, Revision 1, dated August 3, 1994", which incorporates all red-line revisions provided by HNUS letter dated August 4, 1994 and the Greatly Accelerated Sludge Processing Meeting dated August 1, 1994. (Enclosure 4)

2. The period of performance for this effort is August 8, 1994 through November 30, 1994, as delineated in the project schedule provided herein as Enclosure 6. The project schedule identifies the specific milestones and tasks to be performed for the contractual completion of that work defined in the attached statement of work.

3. HNUS is in receipt from EG&G all pertinent data, chemical and geotechnical data (percent solids, specific gravity, density stratification are key parameters) for the waste in the tanks on 750 pad under current conditions, as required to perform the enclosed statement of work.

4. EG&G will provide a liaison person to coordinate project activities with the HNUS Project Manager.

SOW 4.2.1

5. EG&G will attend monthly progress review meetings held at HNUS facilities in Pittsburgh, PA

3.3 OK

6. EG&G will provide to HNUS additional technical information, as required, in time frames which are to be identified and upon which HNUS performance is predicated.

3.2

7. EG&G comments to the HNUS on the draft conceptual design is required by 02 Nov 1994.

8. The technical baseline upon which HNUS' CDR will be developed and delivered pursuant to this contract requirement consists of and is predicated upon the attached statement of work, EG&G documentation provided under the terms of the contract, and all EPA laws and regulations, as of the date of this task order. Further the proposal price is predicated on the same terms.

9. Estimated costs for Other Direct Costs are not offered to be contractually capped. These costs are estimates based on the most current, accurate and complete data available as stated herein.

capped unless contractually authorized

2/47

attachment 3

ASSUMPTIONS AND CONDITIONS

10. The terms and conditions contained in Master Task Subcontract MTS 225471AS are applicable to the performance of this task order as required.

11. HNUS acknowledges the receipt of Amendment No. 1 to Solicitation No 225471001ST3 dated 16 Aug 1994.

12. HNUS will provide to EG&G a white paper describing the general design and engineering basis for the process which will treat the pond sludges by 24 Aug 1994.

13. HNUS will provide to EG&G a draft conceptual design which expands on the white paper by 12 October 1994.

14. HNUS will provide to EG&G a final conceptual design which incorporates EG&G comments by 30 Nov 1994.

15. HNUS will provide to the EG&G Technical Program Manager a monthly status report by the 15th of the month as delineated in item 4.2 of the Master Task Subcontract 225471AS, Statement of Work.

16. HNUS will provide to the EG&G Subcontract Administrator a monthly accrual report by the 20th of the month as delineated in clause 14 of the Master Task Subcontract 225471AS.

17. It is understood that an Irrevocable Letter of Credit will not be required under this task because less than 50 percent of the work will be performed on the Rocky Flats site.

18. Letter Task Order No. 225471001ST3 will be canceled and superseded upon definitization of this proposal.

33147

STATEMENT OF WORK
FOR
ROCKY FLATS
SOLAR POND PROJECTS
ACCELERATED SLUDGE PROCESSING
CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

ROCKY FLATS ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY SITE
GOLDEN, COLORADO

Prepared by
Solar Pond Projects
Bruce A. Troutman
EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc.

August 3, 1994

Revision 1

Approved: _____

Date: 8/3/94

CA Approved: _____

Date: 8.3.94

Reviewed for Classification:

Not Required per D. A. Ringle
Memo DAR-039-93 of May 26, 1993

Date: August 3, 1994

Attachment 4
Page 108 of 14

STATEMENT OF WORK
SOLAR POND PROJECTS
ACCELERATED SLUDGE PROCESSING - CONCEPTUAL DESIGN
PURCHASE REQUISITION #P357177

1.0 OBJECTIVE:

The objective of this Statement of Work is to develop two deliverables: a White Paper which contains conceptual design criteria and a Final Conceptual Design Report which describes in detail the Sludge Processing System. The pond sludges have been removed from the five 207 Solar Evaporation Ponds and 788 Clarifier are being stored in tanks on the 750 Pad. The program objective is to design a process to minimally treat sludges, water, salts and brine ~~process these sludges into stabilized pellets~~ for disposal under the cap of Operable Unit 4 (OU 4).

per 8/4 telecon see the 5 bullets in Attachment 1 Meeting Minutes

2.0 SCOPE OF WORK:

The Subcontractor shall first develop a White Paper which describes the general design and engineering basis for a ~~Chemical Solidification System (CSS)~~ system which will treat sludges to the performance standards defined in the Draft Interim Measures/Interim Remedial Action Decision Document ~~solidify pondsludges into pellets~~ for disposal under the Engineered barrier of OU 4. Available Treatability Study Reports and Process Formulation Reports will be used as the basis for these two design criteria deliverables. The White Paper will be used as an input to the OU 4 Interim Measures/Interim Remedial Action Decision Document being written by others. The Subcontractor shall develop a design for a CSS process which utilizes, as appropriate, existing GFE equipment remaining from the earlier Halliburton-NUS (HNUS) process train erection task, currently available on the Rocky Flats Plant. Subcontractor shall also develop a Final Conceptual Design Report which expands on the White Paper, ~~existing~~ Engineering Design, Characterization, and Treatability data to meet Rocky Flats Plant requirements to support Title II design of a ~~Pelletized~~ Sludge Processing System. A single process system is required to process all of the 207 Ponds sludges ~~into pellets~~.

Per 8/4 telecon delete

3.0 GENERAL BACKGROUND:

3.1 General:

Operable Unit Four (OU 4), the Solar Ponds, is an element of the Department of Energy's Environmental Restoration Program at the Rocky Flats Plant. OU 4 includes five solar evaporation ponds: 207A, 207B series (north, center and south), and 207C. In the late 1950s, the ponds were used to store and evaporate low-level radioactive process water.

per 8/4 telecon + be utilized as reference document.

Existing Characterization and Treatability Studies, Process Formulation Reports, and Design Work developed by Halliburton-NUS Corporation define CSS process formulas and process systems, which, if implemented, will produce two stabilized waste forms from two process trains which meet Federal and State Land Disposal Restrictions for Hazardous Waste. It is intended that the process formula(s) will be redefined in a separate subcontract to enable operation of only one equipment train.

3.2 Sludge Constituents and Characteristics:

Wastes from the Solar Evaporation "B" Pond are a combination of liquid and solids, the total stored volume of which is approximately 240,000 gallons. Wastes from the Solar Evaporation "C" Pond are a combination of liquid, sludge, and salts, the total stored volume

25/47

Attachment 4

of which is approximately 400,000 gallons. Wastes from the Pond Clarifier are predominantly sludge, the total stored volume of which is approximately 75,000 gallons. The hazardous waste codes associated with the wastes in the ponds are as follows: F001, F002, F005, F006, F007, F009 and D008.

EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. Solar Pond Projects will provide the Subcontractor with existing specific data on chemical and geotechnical data for the wastes from each Solar Evaporation Pond and the 788 Clarifier.

4.0 TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS / TASKS:

4.1 General Requirements:

4.1.1 The Subcontractor shall provide all materials, personnel, equipment, procedures, and services required to accomplish all items called for in this Statement of Work.

4.1.2 The work shall be accomplished by the Subcontractor's direct staff or, if necessary, sub-tier Subcontractors. All sub-tier subcontractors shall be approved by the Contractor (EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc.) through a technical evaluation following the proposal.

4.1.3 The Subcontractor shall be responsible for the professional quality, technical accuracy, and the coordination of all procedures and other services furnished. The Subcontractor shall, without additional compensation, correct or revise any errors or deficiencies in its procedures or other services.

4.1.4 The Subcontractor shall be knowledgeable of and shall follow the EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. Plant Health and Safety Practices Manual requirements. Copies of this manual will be issued under separate cover, if needed.

4.1.5 The Subcontractor shall ensure that all Subcontractor personnel receive appropriate training and indoctrination, as defined in EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. procedures, prior to working in controlled or restricted areas of Rocky Flats Plant.

4.2 Meetings:

4.2.1 The following list of meetings shall be required during the project:

- A kickoff meeting at the subcontractor's office to review and clarify the scope of work and schedule as called for in this Statement of Work.
- Status report meetings to be held at the Subcontractors offices no less than once a month during the progress of the work.
- Subcontractor may propose additional meetings if deemed appropriate as priced options.

These meetings will be attended by appropriate members of the Contractor's support team. The Subcontractor shall have representatives available at each meeting to provide input and respond to questions.

Attachment 4

4.3 Specific Tasks:

4.3.1 Task 1: The Subcontractor shall develop a White Paper which describes in Regulatory Language the general design and engineering basis for a minimally treated sludge process ~~sludge CSS process~~. This process will treat ~~solidify~~ all the sludge materials from the Solar Evaporation Ponds (currently being stored in high density polyethylene tanks on the 750 Pad) and minimally treat sludge materials to meet the Performance Standards defined ~~pelletize the solidified material~~ for ~~eventual~~ disposal under the cap as part of the OU 4 Closure. The designed process shall produce material that is of a size and composition which meets applicable Interim Measures/Interim Remedial Action Performance Standards ~~LDR~~ standards, such that the material can be buried as part of the OU 4 Closure. Specifically the subcontractor will provide a conceptual design basis for:

1. A system/process to recover the sludges and water from the storage tanks.
2. A system to transport the sludge and water to the process ~~chemical stabilization~~ unit.
3. A single process facility that will treat ~~stabilize~~ pondsludges derived from 3 sources, 207C Pond, 207B South Pond and the 788 Clarifier.
4. ~~A system to transform the stabilized sludges into pellets having a nominal diameter of 1 inch or less.~~
5. A system to effect delivery of treated sludge into the operating area of the ~~storeware the produced pellets for a reasonable time as defined by the Process Formula or Process Control Plan, on 750 Pad until the contractor can effect delivery of the pellets into the~~ closure of OU 4. Closure of OU 4 is to be accomplished by others.
6. ~~A proposed definition of Waste Acceptance Criteria to be used by the Contractor to effect burial of the product pellets during the closure of OU 4. This proposed definition of WAC may be incorporated into the IMRA DD by others.~~
7. A Schedule for definitive design (Title II).
8. A schedule of actual operation.
9. A schedule of installation.
10. A schedule to clean and remove the process system after all sludges have been processed.
11. Standards and requirements to clean and remove the process system when all sludge has been processed.
12. Conceptual cost estimate to accomplish ~~design~~, installation, operation, and removal.

per B/A telecon effect delivery to the limits only excludes placement.

per B/A telecon (current)

4.3.2 Task 2: The Subcontractor shall develop a Final Conceptual Design Report which describes, in detail, the design and engineering bases for the system to minimally treat sludges, waters and salts ~~Pelletized Sludge Processing System~~. The Final Conceptual Design Report shall expand on the White Paper (Task 1). The report shall be sufficient in form and content to support the requirements of a Rocky Flats Plant Title II design of a system to minimally treat sludges, waters and salts ~~Pelletized Sludge Processing System~~. The Final Conceptual Design Report shall be created according to applicable Conceptual Design requirements outlined in the Rocky Flats Conduct of Engineering Manual (COEM).

Documents created as part of the final conceptual design report include but are not limited to:

7147

Attachment 4
PAGE 4 OF 14

- GES screen (COEM 6.0)
- System Classification Form (COEM 6.3.6)
- Design Calculations (COEM Procedure 6.4)
- Operational Requirements Document (COEM DES-27)
- Engineering Work Plan
- Conceptual Design Report (COEM 6.3.1)

4.3.3 A Solar Pond Projects technical representative will be available to subcontractor personnel for consultation during performance of this task. This representative may be available by telephone or in person at subcontractors office at subcontractors written request.

5.0 DELIVERABLES:

The activities and products defined in this Statement of Work shall be delivered in accordance with the Project Schedule identified as follows (the completion dates on the schedule shall be adjusted to reflect the actual start date for the White Paper):

5.1 General Deliverables:

5.1.1 The Subcontractor shall provide all reproduction services for the deliverables. Ten hard copies shall be delivered to the Contractor Technical Representative in Building 080 at the Interlocken Office Park, Broomfield, Colorado. The Contractor Technical Representative shall be responsible for distribution. Each deliverable shall be delivered in both hard copy and IBM compatible format.

The Subcontractor shall deliver all drawings to the Contractor Technical Representative in both a mylar hard copy (D size) and in electronic format in the below listed Rocky Flats Plant standard CAD/CAE system format.

5.1.2 AUTOCAD

a) Operating System - Release 11 or higher operating on an IBM personal computer or 100% compatible.
b) Files - All AUTOCAD files are to be delivered to the Contractor Technical Representative.
c) Media - The electronic format shall be delivered on 3.5 inch, 1.44 MB or higher density disks. The file names and method used to create the media shall be on a label attached to the disks. An index of file names and descriptive text shall be provided.

The Subcontractor shall produce Contractor selected hard copy drawings using the Rocky Flats Plant standard system to verify system accuracy in converting electronic format to hard copy. The selection of the drawings to be plotted shall be made by the Contractor Technical Representative in accordance with the following sampling plan.

- The sampling plan shall initially be at least 10% of the electronic media deliverables but may be increased to 100% based on the results of the initial 10% sampling. The criterion for acceptance without expanded sampling is: no difference between the sample plots produced from the electronic format when compared with the sample's mylar hard copy and the electronic format

Attachment 4

maintaining standard CAD/CAE geometry (i.e. lines, circles, arcs) for updating and modification at a later date. The Subcontractor shall correct all differences between electronic formats and the mylar hard copies at no additional cost to the Contractor.

5.1.3 Text, Spreadsheets, Schedules. The Subcontractor shall deliver to the Contractor Technical Representative two sets of labeled 3.5 inch, 1.44 MB or higher density disks containing all non-drawing documentation for the project, such as typed text, schedules, and cost estimates. The disks and software used shall be 100% IBM compatible. Typed text shall be produced on WordPerfect version 5.0 or higher software. All software used for other items (such as schedules or cost estimates) shall be industry standard and not specialty software.

5.2 White Paper Deliverable

5.2.1 The White Paper shall consist of the tasks described in Section 4.3.1. In addition, technical detail will be aided by EG&G representatives at the project kickoff meeting described in Section 4.2.1. The EG&G CTR will provide additional technical input as requested by subcontractor.

5.2.2 White Paper Delivery Schedule

Ten "hard" copies of the final version of this white paper shall be delivered to the EG&G CTR on or before 10 working days after ~~award of this contract~~ 10 August 1994. per MJ telecon 8/8/94 + kickoff meeting.

5.3 Final Conceptual Design Report Deliverables

5.3.1 The Final Conceptual Design Report shall consist of the documents listed in the COEM in Section 6, and prepared according to standards described in the COEM. Required documents are listed in the COEM. A partial list is provided below:

- Design Calculations (COEM Procedure 6.3.6)
- Operation Requirements Document (COEM DES-27)
- Engineering Work Plan
- Conceptual Design Report (per COEM 6.3.1)

5.3.2 Final Conceptual Design Report Delivery Schedule

Ten "hard" copies of a complete Draft Version of the Final Conceptual Design Report shall be delivered to the CTR on or before 45 working day after award of contract. Electronic versions of this draft are not a requirement for delivery of this draft. Subcontractor may option to furnish additional copies of this draft version in electronic format.

The EG&G SPP CTR will review the draft documents and return comments to subcontractor in 15 working days or 60 days after award of Contract.

Subcontractor shall resolve and incorporate applicable comments and deliver the Final Version of the Conceptual Design Report to the CTR on or before 80 working days after award of subcontract. Ten "hard" copies and an additional electronic copy are required for this Final Version delivery. Delivery formats are specified in section 5.1 of this SOW.

39/47

Attachment 4
DAQE6094

5.0 APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS:

6.1 Documents:

6.1.1 Treatability Study Report and Process Formulation Report, Ponds 207A, 207B North, 207B Center, and 207B South (Preliminary Draft) dated July 1992, prepared by HNUS Environmental Corporation.

6.1.2 Treatability Study Report and Process Formulation Report for Pond 207C and Clarifier, Revision 0, dated July 1992, prepared by HNUS Environmental Corporation.

6.1.3 Pond Sludge Waste Characterization Report and Clarifier Sludge Waste Characterization Report for EG&G Rocky Flats prepared by HNUS Environmental Corporation, dated March 1992.

6.1.4 (White Paper) Rocky Flats Solar Pond/Pondcrete Stabilization Project - Stabilization of Concentrated Brine Wastes - C Pond Clarifier Process, prepared by HNUS Environmental Corporation, date October 15, 1992.

6.1.5 (White Paper) Rocky Flats Plant Solar Ponds 207A and 207B Remediation Program Description. A/B White Paper for EG&G Rocky Flats prepared by HNUS Environmental Corporation, dated November 5, 1992.

6.1.6 Process Control Plan - C Pond and Clarifier - Pondsludge Waste Processing, prepared by HNUS Environmental Corporation, Revision 0, dated September 24, 1993.

6.1.7 Greatly Accelerated Sludge Processing (GASP) meeting minutes dated August 1, 1994.

6.2 The Rocky Flats Plant COEM is a controlled document. The project Engineer will transfer custody of a current copy to the subcontractor upon completion of subcontract signing. Revisions to the COEM that affect subcontractor performance, cost or schedule, shall be the basis for a change order(s) per existing procurement procedure. Section 6.1 of the COEM is the controlling document for Conceptual Design (Task 2) of this SOW.

6.2.1 ASRP Quality Assurance Plan

6.2.2 ASRP Health and Safety Plan

6.3 Contractor Assumes that Subcontractor has these documents in its possession as of this date. Contractor CTR will furnish missing documents upon receipt of request from Subcontractor.

7.0 QUALITY ASSURANCE

per RA klum delete

7.1 Work performed under this statement of work is governed by appropriate EG&G Rocky Flats Inc. ASRP Quality Assurance Plan. The Conduct of Engineering Manual (COEM) provides the requirements for work done to prepare [68] conceptual design. These documents comply with the Environmental Protection Agency QAMS-005/80 and the Department of energy order 5700.6C. The Subcontractor will comply with the applicable requirements of these documents for all quality affecting activities. As an option, the Subcontractor will comply

attachment 4
DNAP Task #1

with the requirements of an approved and implemented Quality Assurance Plan of its own that meets the intent of the ASME NQA-1 guidance document. If subcontractor elects to implement its own Quality Assurance Plan, this election must be approved in writing by the CTR prior to implementation by the subcontractor. The Subcontractor will exercise due diligence to identify all applicable requirements and define the implementing action to achieve quality goals for those requirements, using a risk based graded approach.

7.2 Organization:

The authority and responsibilities of persons or organizations performing work under this Statement of Work shall be established, documented, and submitted to the Contractor Technical Representative. An organization chart identifying specific individuals by name supported by itemized authorities and responsibilities is a suitable means of documentation.

7.3 Accessibility:

The Subcontractor's work place and working records shall be accessible during normal working hours for verification or audit by EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. or its representatives during the performance of the subcontract. All completed records shall become the property of EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. and shall be turned over to EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. no later than 60 days following the completion of the technical work.

7.4 Specific Prohibitions:

The Subcontractor shall not be permitted to:

1) Provide any safety-related items without prior inspection and acceptance by the EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. Quality Assurance organization.

2) Perform any special processes such as welding, Non-Destructive Evaluation, heat treatment, plating, etc. for which acceptance is based on supplier-furnished personnel qualifications or other quality assurance criteria.

3) Perform inspections or tests of equipment or components for the purpose of determining final acceptance by EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc., except for those inspections and tests conducted in accordance with EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. implementing procedures or Subcontractor procedures which have been approved by EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. All such inspections and tests shall be performed using measuring and test equipment verified and authorized by the Rocky Flats Plant Metrology Laboratory. All work shall be performed under the direct supervision of EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. personnel, and witnessed by qualified EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. personnel.

8.0 SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

8.1 Security Clearances / Escort Requirements:

It is anticipated that more than 90 percent of the work under this Statement of Work will be performed at the Subcontractor's own facility. No known requirement for security clearances exists at this time at the Interlocken facility other than all personnel must be U. S. Citizens. If a physical review of the actual construction site and operation is required, EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. personnel will provide the necessary escort.

6.2 Classification of Information Affecting Project Documentation:

Information and documents generated from this project are exempt from classification review and Unclassified Controlled Nuclear Information review. Reference D. A. Ringle memorandum to Distribution: *Classification Exemption for OU 4 Documents*, DAR-039-93 dated May 26, 1993.

8.3 Contractor Technical Representative:

The Contractor Technical Representative is the single point of technical contact for the Subcontractor. The Contractor Technical Representative will be designated prior to subcontract award. The Contractor and/or the Solar Ponds Project reserves the right to re-designate the Contractor Technical Representative at any time. All technical communications between the Subcontractor, the Contractor, or the Department of Energy shall be initiated through the Contractor Technical Representative. All technical submittals shall be delivered to the Contractor Technical Representative with copies of the letter of transmittal being sent to the Contractor's Subcontract Administrator.

8.4 Partnering Clause

The parties agree that they will pursue, under a voluntary cooperative effort, the possibility of establishing and signing a partnering agreement between the primary parties involved in this project. The purpose of such an agreement is to establish mutual goals and working agreements among this project's participants. Goals which may be established include completion of the project ahead of schedule, minimizing cost growth, avoiding litigation, promoting value engineering, cooperation among people and commitment to teamwork, and prevention of long-term shutdown or disruption of services to the facility. If developed, the agreements will not be a legally binding document, but will represent a commitment to work together toward common goals.

The parties further agree that in order to investigate this possibility, immediately after the project kickoff meeting, a meeting shall be conducted by a professional facilitator and attended by representatives of all interested parties. Participants shall include the representatives of HNUS and EG&G Solar Pond Projects, and the subcontractors senior, Executive Officer, Project Manager, Project Engineer, Project Superintendent, Quality Control Manager, and others the subcontractor deems appropriate. This initial one (1) day meeting shall be conducted prior to the initiation of work. If a partnering agreement is established, a follow-up one-day meeting will also be conducted during the course of the project, but not later than midway through completion.

your 8/4 klecan change to "Subcontractor" what is that the costs associated with meeting (set-up) arrangements are not to be passed on as project costs.

The Subcontractor shall be responsible for providing all arrangements for the partnering meeting as follows. As above, the initial meeting shall be conducted regardless of whether the parties establish a partnering agreement.

a. Partnering Arrangements. In coordination with the Subcontractor, select and hire a professional facilitator who is qualified and experienced in conducting partnering conferences for projects.
b. Arrangements for meeting rooms and hotel accommodations for participants for the initial and follow-up meetings. The meeting location shall not be at the construction site or local office of any participant. The contractor will not be responsible for the travel or accommodation expenses of noncontractor personnel except for the selected facilitator.

12/47

Attachment 14
DAR-040-94

c. In coordination with EG&G Solar Pond Projects, the announcement of: all times, selected planes, and dates of meetings and written invitation to all interested parties.

Attachment 4
DOE 11/20/94

rh/47

GREATLY ACCELERATED SLUDGE PROCESSING (GASP)

MEETING MINUTES, AUGUST 1, 1994

Attending: *#Kathy London, EG&G/SPP
Richard Ninesteel, HNUS/BRE
Tom Beckman, EG&G
Harry Heidkamp, ES/PES
Tom Schmidt, EG&G
Don Brenneman, HNUS/BRE
*Leon Collins, EG&G/SPP

* coordinators for ES/HNUS communications
# recorder

PURPOSE: Group discussion and finalization of working performance standards for minimally-treated pond waste.

PRODUCTS FROM MEETING

Working Performance Standards Established:

- Compacted material (material in-place) must pass paint filter test.
- Compacted material must pass 90% proctor test.
- Any added constituent (like chlorides) must be identified to ES and pass modeling at the Point Of Compliance.
- No gas generation from material under cap.
- Regulatory pathogen control requirement is assumed.

ACTION ITEMS: Due COB Friday 8/5/94

- HNUS will review and advise SPP on how to control pathogens.
- HNUS and SPP will review process to ensure no gas generation will occur.
- ES will provide the latest date they can accommodate the addition of new constituents such as chlorine, to the sludge, or its reaction products.
- ES will review the pathogen control requirements and propose to EG&G any additional potential ARARs or design criteria identified.
- ES will examine scenarios for receipt of dewatered sludge at OU 4 and recommend a preferred scenario (proposed due date August 12, 1994).

MEETING MINUTES

Following introductions and explanation of the scope of each corporate entity, ES presented their conceptual acceptance criteria.

ES:

- Material must pass paint filter test (to meet RCRA)
- Sludge must be incorporated into the waste layer
  - assume sludge by itself won't compact
  - plan to mix with soil/unspecified ratio
- 3% to 5% The percent reported in the meeting was subsequently revised: ~ 7% by volume solidified 2-3% by volume dewatered may based on 5,000 CY pure sludge (dewatered)of waste layer will be sludge (max), less if dewatered.
- No unique handling criterion envisioned
  - assume worker safety at process will adequately control dusting

SPP: Sludge is more like a slime, < 200µ range; so agree unable to compact sludge alone and must consider size range in mixer design.

ES: DOE has introduced idea of including remix under the cap, too. The cap is more or less max'ed out; though we could accommodate 12,000 to 13,000 cubic yards total.

SPP: Existing remix inventory is 8,000 Tri-Walls not including triwall packaging. Any restrictions on burying plastic packaging?

ES: No restriction as such on plastics under cap; but anything that degrades or off-gases could leave unacceptable voids.

HNUS: Could lime be added to the lifts to prevent biological degradation?

ES: Possible, especially if helps achieve the 1000 year protection.

HNUS: Let's discuss chlorination to control biomass. Bioactivity includes the sewage issue: when we were planning to ship to Nevada test Site, NTS has a pathogen constraint. Think it comes from NRC criteria, but not sure if applies to OU 4. Any new ARARs because of the sewage connection?

ES: Adding any hazardous constituent would require ES to review/revise the health-effects. Can check into the pathogens, but need to avoid gas generation for cap-integrity anyway.

SPP: Alternate approaches to sludge preparation include blending with fly ash (for brine absorption) to ensure it passes paint-filter test. Could filter the soluble salts and handle the brine separately. No mechanical process gets rid of the brine. Thermal drying has been investigated before with negative results (and "value engineered" in 1993). SPP will probably need to document why these technologies are not suitable for use in the OU 4 closure.

Could any of the sludge or remix be blended into the cap above the asphalt layers to increase cap capacity? Or blended into the asphalt? Is the assumption that the cap is inviolate a good assumption?

5147

Attachment 4

ES: Any added volume is a negative, though probably could accept fly ash. Blending with soil alone is most desirable. Any other configurations would have to pass the modeling at Point-Of-Compliance; maybe contaminants could go in the asphalt, but not in the cap itself. The design must stop moving around at some point, and we are running out of physical space.

ES: Would not write the proctor test into the construction specifications, rather, so-many passes with a roller. Test compaction and see what you get before issuing specifications. 90% proctor may be achievable. Think of it as needed to support the construction equipment working on top of each lift, and to prevent differential settling of the cap.

SPP: When we write our next statement of work, we may need to call ES and get more details on what drives the chosen compaction and moisture content of soil needed to achieve compaction. If it were useful, could move soils over to the pad to mix with sludge; though probably will be easier to move sludge to the construction site.

Is there an industry standard that addresses pros and cons of working with dry aggregate and adding water to suit, or working with aggregates of varying moisture content?

HNUS: Gut-feel is that we would have to add something like fly ash to get the C-Pond salts/sludge to pass a paint filter test.

ES: If need to look into adding fly ash, suggest use ASTM definitions to compare with list of COCs.

HNUS: Would it be useful to dispose some of the sludge handling equipment under the cap with the B788 debris?

SPP: Volume of contaminated layer probably will be limiting.

HNUS: A covered roto-tiller with internal spray bars might be a good way to use the brine for compaction moisture while suppressing airborne concerns.

SPP: Rad Engineering would probably prefer this method over dry mixing.

SPP: We are looking into using some of our Investigation Derived Material for HNUS treatability studies. Some IDM is contaminated and some is not.

ES: A good contact at ES for soils is Richard Henry.

SPP: Reviewed contracting structure: appears HNUS can proceed with today's information under the contract we have. Tom Beckman asked that Leon Collins and Kathy London be used as technical contact points for ES and HNUS exchanges. Note the following individuals need to be copied for contract purposes:

Phil Nixon, ES
Rich Ninesteel, HNUS/BRE
Andy Ledford, EG&G
Tom Beckman, EG&G

attachment 4
000013094

Halliburton NUS Corporation
17 August, 1994

Organizational Conflict of Interest
Supplemental Disclosure Statement
EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc.
MTS 225471001AS3/ST3
Solar Pond Projects Accelerated Sudge Processing Conceptual Design

This Organizational Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statement dated August 17, 1994 is being submitted as a supplement to our previous disclosure dated February 11, 1992 under RFP No. 97256WS (currently MTS 225471AS).

The U.S. Department of Energy Acquisition Regulations require that any direct or indirect relationship (financial, organizational, contractual, or otherwise) with any business entity which would be affected in any way by the proposed work, be disclosed.

Set forth below are all relevant contracts and proposals with EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. and Department of Energy:

EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. Contract No. MTS 225471, Task Order 353010KJ3

Halliburton NUS is to conduct a treatability study to develop the chemical stabilization and solidification formulation for the existing pondcrete and saltcrete sludges.

Fernald Environmental Restoration Management Corporation; Contract No. 04424320-30-T002

Halliburton NUS provides personnel to work on the Fernald Environmental Management Project in the areas of remediation investigation, feasibility studies, site-training, site-laboratory, safety analysis, risk assessment and technology development.

I hereby certify, as a representative of my organization, that to the best of my knowledge and belief, all relevant facts--concerning past, present, or currently planned interest or activities (financial, contractual, organizational or otherwise) which relate to the proposed work and bear on whether I have (or the organization has) a possible conflict of interest with respect to (1) being able to render impartial, technically sound, and objective assistance or advise, or (2) being given an unfair*/competitive advantage--are fully disclosed above.

Signature: Robert Waller

Date: August 17, 1994

Name: Robert Waller

Title: Vice President

Attachment 4